E-FILED 10/12/07

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN JOSE DIVISION

THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY	OF
CALIFORNIA	

NO. C 03 05669 JW (RS)

Plaintiff/Counterclaim Defendant, v.

ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO COMPEL

MICRO THERAPEUTICS, INC., et al,

Defendants/Counterclaimants and Third Party Plaintiffs,

v.

BOSTON SCIENTIFIC CORPORATION, et al.

Third Party Defendants.

Defendants' motion to compel filed on October 11, 2007 has been considered on shortened time pursuant to the parties' stipulation and the Court's order of the same date. The motion is GRANTED. Plaintiff's trial brief states its intention to prove that, "Mr. Dawes went above and beyond his obligations to the PTO during prosecution Although not required, Mr. Dawes even requested an independent prior art search, incorporating the results of that search into the patent application. No intent to deceive can be found in light of this evidence." Because the fact that Mr. Dawes commissioned an "independent prior art search" is being used as evidence of his good faith, plaintiff has squarely put in issue the materials it claims are privileged. Plaintiff is correct that

relevance is not a basis for piercing the privilege, but affirmative reliance gives rise to an implied waiver. See Chevron Corp. v. Pennzoil Co., 974 F.2d 1156, 1162 (9th Cir. 1992) ("The privilege which protects attorney-client communications may not be used both as a sword and a shield. [Citation.] Where a party raises a claim which in fairness requires disclosure of the protected communication, the privilege may be implicitly waived.")

Here, plaintiff cannot offer the fact of the search to prove Dawes's good faith (or, more precisely, to rebut defendant's claims of inequitable conduct) while simultaneously shielding information as to what he may have known about how that search was conducted and other such matters. Finally, the fact that defendants may have known about the search long ago does not make the motion to compel untimely, given that it was brought promptly upon plaintiff's disclosure of its intent to rely on the search in the manner described above.

IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: October 12, 2007

United States Magistrate Judge

United States District Court

28

ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO COMPEL

C 03 05669 JW (RS)

1	THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT NOTICE OF THIS ORDER HAS BEEN GIVEN TO:
2	David L. Anstaett david.anstaett@hellerehrman.com
3	Gabrielle E. Bina gabrielle.bina@hellerehrman.com
4	Wendy Lynn Bjerknes Wbjerknes@fenwick.com
5	Henry Zuzueta Carbajal, III hcarbajal@fenwick.com, ssanford@fenwick.com
6	Carolyn Chang cchang@fenwick.com, vschmitt@fenwick.com
7	Chien-Ju Alice Chuang achuang@fenwick.com, dyoungman@fenwick.com
8	Charles G. Curtis, Jr charles.curtis@hellerehrman.com
9	J. Anthony Downs jdowns@goodwinprocter.com
10	Julie Lynn Fieber jfieber@flk.com
11	Rita A. Hao rita.hao@ucop.edu
12	David J. Harth david.harth@hellerehrman.com, patricia.dean@hellerehrman.com, teresa.anders@hellerehrman.com, theresa.gresl@hellerehrman.com
13 14	David Edwin Jones dejones@hewm.com
15	Michael Francis Kelleher mkelleher@flk.com
16	Amanda Marie Kessel akessel@goodwinprocter.com
17	Lissa Rose Koop Lissa.Koop@Hellerehrman.com
18	Charlene Marie Morrow cmorrow@fenwick.com
19	Autumn Noelle Nero autumn.nero@hellerehrman.com, djmorgan@hellerehrman.com, Sarah.Stephens@hellerehrman.com
20	Lynn Harold Pasahow lpasahow@fenwick.com, tchow@fenwick.com
21	Nicole Elise Perroton
22	Michael Kenneth Plimack mplimack@hewm.com
23	Patrick Eugene Premo ppremo@fenwick.com, kculp@fenwick.com, mguidoux@fenwick.com
24	Colin G. Sandercock csandercock@proskauer.com, cherron@proskauer.com
25	Roland Schwillinski rschwillinski@goodwinprocter.com
26	Michael Jeffrey Shuster mshuster@fenwick.com, tthomas@fenwick.com
27	John S. Skilton john.skilton@hellerehrman.com

Case 5:03-cv-05669-JW Document 946 Filed 10/12/07 Page 4 of 4

28

ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO COMPEL C 03 05669 JW (RS)

/s/ BAK